

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2016 10:05 AM
To: OIG Hotline
Subject: Referral/Callback Requested

November 30, 2016

I am looking for guidance as to whether or not the EPA OIG is the appropriate avenue for my issue. I want to complain about an EPA-funded, primacy State (Utah) drinking water program violating EPA Safe Drinking Water Act regulations, and violating that State's own implementing Rules.

The issue is rather technical. Can someone with expertise in water engineering and science contact me?

Here's a brief technical synopsis:

EPA regulates primary and secondary disinfection of drinking water. Distinction is made between primary disinfectant chemicals and secondary disinfectant chemicals. EPA publishes disinfection efficacy information (concentration x time = required "CT" levels in drinking water) for primary chemical disinfectants. EPA does not publish "CT" requirements for every secondary chemical disinfectant. State approval of a secondary-only chemical disinfectant -- for which there is no EPA "CT" published "CT" data -- for a primary disinfection application creates, in my professional judgment, an imminent public health hazard.

I am seeking guidance as how to bring this imminent public health hazard to the attention of EPA or other proper authorities. Perhaps EPA OIG responsibility for investigation of EPA funds mismanagement is the proper avenue for my complaint.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL

January 29, 2017

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Office of Inspector General Hotline Complaint 2017-0110

FROM:

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Special Agent, Hotline Manager
Headquarters, Office of Inspector General

TO:

Patrick Sullivan
Assistant Inspector General
Office of Investigations

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG), Hotline received a telephone message on the EPA Hotline (888) 546-8740 on January 24, 2017, at 9:43AM. The message was from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). The message left was as follows:

Hello my name is (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and my phone number is (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). I have been reading the reports about executive orders regarding the communication from the EPA. I have a complaint to file that we are being run by a fucking fascist. I want you to know that the American people have your backs. We are not going to stand for this bullshit. I believe in the work you do. I work for the federal government and I how much work you do and that you care. We are going to get this cock sucker out office. I cannot bear to see what is happening to this country. We are fucking there for you. I do not expect you to call me back.

Please inform the Hotline upon the completion of this assignment so that it can be closed. If you have any further questions, please call me (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-3905

January 27, 2017

Kevin Minoli
Designated Agency Ethics Official
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20460

Dear Mr. Minoli:

I write for an update on procedures EPA has put in place to ensure that all new Agency employees are following federal laws and regulations governing conflicts of interest, and that appropriate safeguards have been put in place to protect the prerogatives of the Agency in litigation in which EPA is a party, EPA has DOJ representation, and in ongoing criminal and civil enforcement matters. These conflicts may be especially acute and involve issues of legal ethics and professional responsibility when new Agency employees are attorneys who have represented clients in litigation against EPA. Specifically, I have the following questions:

As of today, are any individuals who are not EPA employees, including but not limited to members of the Trump transition team, receiving briefings on ongoing litigation in which EPA is a party, EPA has DOJ representation, or criminal or civil enforcement matters? If so, who are these individuals, why are they receiving briefings, and what safeguards have been put in place to ensure compliance with all federal conflict of interest laws and regulations?

What are the names and titles of Schedule C appointees at EPA who have been brought on since January 20, 2017?

On what date did each of these Schedule C appointees receive required ethics trainings and/or briefings?

What steps have been taken to determine whether any Schedule C appointee have covered relationships pursuant to 5 C.F.R. 2635.502(b)?

What steps have been taken to ensure that Schedule C appointees are not participating personally and substantially, including through briefings, in particular matters involving specific parties with which they have a covered relationship?

Have any waivers been granted to this recusal requirement? If so, please specify the individuals receiving the waiver, the particular matter to which the waiver applies, and the reasons for granting the waiver.

Are there any other political appointees not otherwise listed above currently receiving briefings or participating in particular matters at EPA? If so, who are these individuals, what is their role at EPA, and what safeguards have been put in place to ensure compliance with all federal conflict of interest laws and regulations?

Thank you for your ongoing efforts to protect the integrity of the EPA. Given the Environment and Public Works Committee is currently considering the nomination of Scott Pruitt as EPA Administrator, I request answers to these questions by the close of business, Tuesday, January 31st.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sheldon Whitehouse', written in a cursive style.

Sheldon Whitehouse
United States Senator

Cc: Catherine McCabe, Acting Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency
Arthur A. Elkins Jr., Inspector General, Environmental Protection Agency
Walter M. Shaub, Jr., Director, U.S. Office of Government Ethics



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL

February 3, 2017

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Office of Inspector General Hotline Complaint 2017-0122

FROM:

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Special Agent, Hotline Manager
Headquarters, Office of Inspector General

TO:

Francesca Grifo
Scientific Integrity Official

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG), Hotline received an electronic message from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) on January 26, 2017. The message is requesting that the EPA OIG investigate mismanagement and failure to apply the EPA's Science Integrity. The Hotline reviewed the message and determined that it should be referred to your office.

We established EPA OIG Hotline Number 2017-0122. We are referring this matter to your office for whatever action you determine necessary. Please inform the Hotline at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) within the next 5 calendar days that this referral was received. In addition, it requested that any action from this Hotline be reported back to the OIG. Please do not hesitate calling me at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) if there are any questions.

Attachment:

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 3:43 PM
To: OIG Hotline
Subject: Please Investigate Mismanagement and Failure to Apply the EPA's Policy on Scientific Integrity

Inspector General,

Recent public statements made by EPA Transition (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) suggest that the Transition Team is flagrantly violating the EPA's 2012 Policy on Scientific Integrity. I am writing to ask that you begin an immediate investigation into this matter to ensure that the public can continue to trust scientific information disseminated by the Agency.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was quoted by NPR as saying that "(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)"

[\(Full article here\)](#)

This is clearly in violation of the Policy on Scientific Integrity which explicitly "prohibits managers and other Agency leadership from intimidating or coercing scientists to alter scientific data, findings, or professional opinions or inappropriately influencing scientific advisory boards."

While investigating (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), I urge you to explore whether other Presidential Transition members or Agency officials have also violated this policy. Please also investigate whether the implementation of this gag order has also violated federal whistleblower protection standards by failing to remind EPA employees of their rights under the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)